

# Re: Correct Info!

Bob Carlitz ([bob@info-ren.pitt.edu](mailto:bob@info-ren.pitt.edu))

Wed, 4 Sep 1996 22:51:48 -0400 (EDT)

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Richard Buro: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
  - Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Correct Info!"
  - In reply to: Steve Kohn: "Correct Info!"
- 

One of my scripts accidentally clipped out a line from Steve's message.  
His next to last paragraph should read:

I believe that you'd need at least the first three items: connection to school; connection in school; and hardware in order to provide Internet access. Adding up the initial and ongoing you get a range of ~\$23B to ~\$35B. And most of us would agree that prof. dev. is also need to make this all work.

Sorry for the glitch. I have fixed this in the on-line archive, but I wanted to correct it for people who are following the seminar by e-mail.

Bob Carlitz  
Moderator

---

- Next message: Richard Buro: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
- Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Correct Info!"
- In reply to: Steve Kohn: "Correct Info!"

# Re: leverage vs. equity

Richard Buro ([rwburo@tenet.edu](mailto:rwburo@tenet.edu))

Thu, 5 Sep 1996 08:53:37 -0500 (CDT)

- Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
  - Next message: Jan Bolluyt: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
  - Previous message: Bob Carlitz: "Re: Correct Info!"
  - Maybe in reply to: Bob Carlitz: "leverage vs. equity"
  - Next in thread: Jan Bolluyt: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
- 

To Bob and all members of the group:

First thanks for your direction and leadership, Bob. Focused discussions definitely help.

To the group, from Bob's note on leverage vs. equity, here is my \$ 0.02.

I think that to date a lot of grant monies (particularly those from governmental agencies) have been in kind, challenge, matching funds types of opportunities with the leveraged focus, that Bob mentions early on.

The traditional problem has been, at least IMHO, that the Internet service provision piece has come ahead of an operational network. I feel that you (districts and agencies) need to address some burning needs issues before going for equipment. Those needs issues should include:

1. What am trying to do now, that a network will help me with?
2. What types of applications can I put across a network that will help me with # 1?
3. What hardware runs the apps in # 2 the best?
4. What standards should I comply with in my internal network?
5. Does my network need to connect to the larger Internet?

Ad nauseum, ad infinitum....

The bottom line is this -- planning and asking tough questions must come first in the process resulting in an overall plan for implementation.

I have also experienced conversations with numerous engineers that say LANs come first, followed by WANs and then the Internet. I have also experienced (and reported to this group in other posts) the idea that 33% of any technology project should be devoted to training, 33% to technical support, and 33% to physical resources (hardware, software, etc.).

IMHO, any funding that subsidizes these processes must insist on use for training, support, and equipment probably in that order -- if not, maybe training, equipment, then support -- but all three pieces need to be in place.

As far as the scope of Universal Service subsidies is concerned, I believe that target populations under 250,000 should be considered first. Most large communities and especially Metro areas have lots of funding sources as opposed to those communities with lower populations, much less rural areas such as in the Western US. In order to achieve equity, a focus on those underserved areas should be made first.

Just my \$ 0.02.

---

Richard Buro, Master TENET Mentor/Facilitator INTERNET: [rwburo@tenet.edu](mailto:rwburo@tenet.edu)  
Coordinator of Instructional Media VOICE PHONE: 817-791-6156  
Temple Independent School District OFFICE FAX : 817-791-6158  
300 South 27th Street PAPER FAX : 817-791-6100  
Temple, TX 76504-4012 HOME VOICE PHONE: 817-778-0386  
Moderator: [tenet.interest.videomakers](mailto:tenet.interest.videomakers) Remember the crew of Apollo 1  
[tenet.interest.txstudies](mailto:tenet.interest.txstudies) Remember the Challenger 7.  
[tenet.taet.memberinfo](mailto:tenet.taet.memberinfo)  
[tenet.projects.nasa-iliad](mailto:tenet.projects.nasa-iliad) WE MAKE YOUR MAGIC HAPPEN!!!

---

- 
- **Next message:** [Jan Bolluyt: "Re: leverage vs. equity"](#)
  - **Previous message:** [Bob Carlitz: "Re: Correct Info!"](#)
  - **Maybe in reply to:** [Bob Carlitz: "leverage vs. equity"](#)
  - **Next in thread:** [Jan Bolluyt: "Re: leverage vs. equity"](#)

# Re: leverage vs. equity

Jan Bolluyt ([jbolluyt@spirit-lake.k12.ia.us](mailto:jbolluyt@spirit-lake.k12.ia.us))

Thu, 05 Sep 1996 00:31:18 -0500

- **Messages sorted by:** [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - **Next message:** Maryanne Simonsen: "Re: Universal Service"
  - **Previous message:** Richard Buro: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
  - **Maybe in reply to:** Bob Carlitz: "leverage vs. equity"
  - **Next in thread:** Dennis Golombek: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
- 

Bob's question concerning building infrastructure is critical.

Ultimately, the universal service has to affect student and patron learning.

Claims of Internet service have ranged from one machine on a 2400 baud modem to every machine in school on a T1 or better line with a fiber optics intranet. And Internet is just one facet of technology for libraries and schools.

Yes, the costs of the infrastructure must be addressed in order to improve learning. Finding qualified people to design, install and maintain that equipment is another need and cost that must be handled.

Internet boxes, satellite transfer, off-peak downloading, and other technologies will help defray some costs, but not enough.

---

- **Next message:** Maryanne Simonsen: "Re: Universal Service"
- **Previous message:** Richard Buro: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
- **Maybe in reply to:** Bob Carlitz: "leverage vs. equity"
- **Next in thread:** Dennis Golombek: "Re: leverage vs. equity"

# Re: Universal Service

Maryanne Simonsen ([Maryanne.Simonsen@mci.com](mailto:Maryanne.Simonsen@mci.com))

Thu, 05 Sep 1996 12:54 -0500 (CDT)

- Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
  - Next message: Preuss, Paul: "Thoughts from New York"
  - Previous message: Jan Bolluyt: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
- 

Hi All,

As I review the the comments and concerns revolving around universal service a common thread needs to be woven to make universal service happen in a community. Bringing advanced technologies into their environment requires that a community embrace it in concept; define what it is it wants to accomplish for it's schools, libraries and citizens; realistically assess what resources are available from local businesses, volunteers, civic organizations and produce an implementation plan. The plan should define where technology will begin, possibly with one school, where the community will be implementing it 3 yrs from now and what is the ultimate goal. The technology process can be overwhelming as one tries to "boil the ocean" including every scenario one can imagine.

Implementing technology is an evolving process that begins with a stake in the ground- however small, but realistically accomplishable. Critical to this process is team of motivated citizens/parents that will do the leg-work, getting educated about technology, networking with businesses, organizations, government entities at all levels to establish the necessary partnerships, and making sure infrastructure is correctly installed. Yes, this takes time and effort but it is the motivated, organized communities that will successfully bring universal service to its citizens.

---

- Next message: Preuss, Paul: "Thoughts from New York"
- Previous message: Jan Bolluyt: "Re: leverage vs. equity"

# Thoughts from New York

Preuss, Paul (PPREUSS@Herkimer-BOCES.moric.org)

Thu, 5 Sep 1996 16:33:54 +5 EST

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Dennis Golombek: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
  - Previous message: Maryanne Simonsen: "Re: Universal Service"
  - Next in thread: Currie Morrison : "Re: Thoughts from New York"
- 

I am in my 33rd year as an educator - serving as secondary teacher, high school assistant principal, principal, superintendent and now as an assistant superintendent of a BOCES (intermediate school district).

One of my current assignments is administrative oversight of our BOCES LAN. We have over 50 administrative workstations and an equal number of student workstations tied to five servers which are interconnected to form our LAN. Our LAN is - in turn - tied to a WAN which covers school districts in five BOCES regions.

I have briefly reviewed two documents from the index of available material at [Http://info-ren.pitt.edu](http://info-ren.pitt.edu) They are:

The comments from the NY State Education Department on the proposed rulemaking on universal service  
<http://info-ren.pitt.edu/universal-service/comments/html/156.html>

and

The comments from NYNEX on the same topic  
<http://info-ren.pitt.edu/universal-service/comments/html/160.html>

Although I favor and endorse most all of what the NYSED has commented on - I also found interesting and valid points expressed by NYNEX - particularly their identification of the need for an "educational vision". I recommend both documents to interested members of this seminar.

I also want to express my own views - limited as they are.

- 1) I agree with Mary Harcey Kruter and others that we, and the Federal Gov't should stick to the issue of providing expanded universal service and that the issues of equipment, training, internal wiring and other aspects of the total system be left to the local school district or organization to resolve. We must focus on access.
- 2) The federal funding for access should be almost invisible to the school/organization much in the same way as "state contract" prices are negotiated for other commodities. For example, if a school district wants to purchase a car - it can do so at a universal, pre-agreed upon "state contract" price for the vehicle (in NYS). Universal access should work in much the same way. Local providers would be bound by the state or federal contract price for specific degrees of services and would

receive reimbursement either directly from the feds or through a state based agency. As a school administrator I want a certain degree of stability in cost and I want to keep the process simple at my end. This will usually result in the greatest number of students benefitting in the shortest amount of time.

- 3) I agree that "universal service" should be defined as broadly as possible - in terms on bandwidth etc - but not in terms of supporting all types of agencies and organizations. Let's keep the focus on the intent of the legislation while making technological provisions for the future - which in this arena of telecommunications seems to be happening next week.

If the connections are made for the schools, libraries, etc - it will not be long before the same connections are made available to the community at large.

In our own case - we have chosen to go with a local vendor who is installing a POP in our own town. This will enable many smaller towns around us to be but just a local call away from the POP - encouraging people living there to get connected.

Bottom line - let's keep it simple and focused upon the intent realizing that there are many "related issues" with which we must deal at the local level.

Paul Preuss  
PPreuss@Herkimer-BOCES.moric.org  
Phone: 315 867 2007 FAX: 315 867 2024

- 
- **Next message:** Dennis Golombek: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
  - **Previous message:** Maryanne Simonsen: "Re: Universal Service"
  - **Next in thread:** Currie Morrison : "Re: Thoughts from New York"

# Re: leverage vs. equity

Dennis Golombek ([golombek@localnet.com](mailto:golombek@localnet.com))

Thu, 05 Sep 1996 19:07:09 -0500

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: calvin branche: "second week thoughts"
  - Previous message: Preuss, Paul: "Thoughts from New York"
  - Maybe in reply to: Bob Carlitz: "leverage vs. equity"
  - Next in thread: Lisa Fleck: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
- 

Bob wrote on Wednesday:

> On the other hand, if schools and libraries lack the funds to cover  
> other necessary components of the infrastructure, there is a danger  
> that many sites will be left with subsidized lines coming into the  
> building and nothing inside to connect to them. And it's likely that  
> this situation will occur most frequently in precisely those schools  
> where the need is most urgent.  
>  
> How acute is this problem likely to be - and what mechanisms can we  
> suggest to avoid it? This is not an easy question, but the answers  
> that we find for it may be crucial for developing a UniversalService  
> subsidy which can effectively meet the needs of all students and library patrons.  
>  
> Bob Carlitz  
> Moderator

I believe the problem is already acute. In my district, a rustbelt community, in which there is no longer any major industry, we are faced with trying to keep the tax burden low along with less state aid despite a lucrative New York State lottery that supposedly is dedicated to education. ( I don't understand the reasoning but maybe Gov. Pataki does.) In order to keep the burden down the school board eliminated networking capabilities but allowed in the hardware. The connection fees are too high at this point for a poor district.

I believe there is also fear of what the networking might bring in to the school( e.g., porn) and that the few teachers willing to use the net can't prevent their students from obtaining such things.

My district has also been selected as one of the 65 school districts around the country to obtain free cable modems in our schools courtesy of a plan from the National Cable Television Association(NCTA). We won't see this until at least Sept.'97 because the cable operator hasn't even started running the fibre in our city. Should cable also be considered under US? My people here in Western New York are very confused as to the status of who will be offering what in the next year. We hear the cable companies are testing POTS, the TELCOS are trying to deliver cable services with video on demand and soon NYNEX will be Bell Atlantic. There may be a reluctance on the part of many school districts to do anything until all this shakes down.

It is because of all the turmoil in providers that my belief is that US should cover all bases of services, POTS through two-way video, satellite, etc. along with wording which can cover any future tech



breakthroughs. If all bases aren't covered now it could another 50 or more years before things get updated.

Dennis

- 
- **Next message:** calvin branche: "second week thoughts"
  - **Previous message:** Preuss. Paul: "Thoughts from New York"
  - **Maybe in reply to:** Bob Carlitz: "leverage vs. equity"
  - **Next in thread:** Lisa Fleck: "Re: leverage vs. equity"

# second week thoughts

calvin branche (cbranche@innet.com)

Thu, 5 Sep 1996 21:09:03 -0400

- Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
  - Next message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Greetings from the FCC"
  - Previous message: Dennis Golombek: "Re: leverage vs. equity"
- 

There has been much information, almost an overload, to deal with this week. For my part I am trying to struggle through the submissions to the FCC by the Florida PSC, Florida Cable TV Assn., and anything else from Florida that is relevant to the Universal Fund topic. It is a difficult task, but similar to the one facing all of us: large groups which can afford legal staffs can submit information that is almost impossible to understand, given the twists and turns they make to place themselves at an advantage whenever a final decision is made (final until the first lawsuit, that is).

I wonder how successful the approach is, from anybody's point of view, which discusses so many "trees" at the expense of the "forest." No doubt that the FCC will defend its view in language equally formidable, and equally confusing in many instances. For me some posters to this seminar have managed to see the "forest" and as a veteran former teacher I applaud their view.

For in the long run no matter how universal the hook-up is, no matter how fair the cost is, and how good the training, you are still left with the problem of a non-universal theme in U.S. education. When I left teaching my high school in Massachusetts was just beginning to train teachers and it became a server around the same time. Today, two years later, they have every room in every school hooked to the Net, and teachers/administrators email back and forth at will. That's really great, and I know from reading postings here that this is not an unusual case.

However, my former school is suffering from over-crowding, a curriculum that is fairly regularly changed (for what reason I cannot fathom) and what seems to be a lack of universality in its approach to curriculum development. Which leads me back to where I started. No matter how the Information Highway is instituted it will still be only as good as the curriculum it serves. It is a tool, not the omega of educational philosophy.

If we were to look to Germany and Japan for some pointers we might well find that the tool promised by universal funding could be more rapidly and successfully achieved.

Back to the "trees."

cal branche  
chair, Pasco County (FL)  
Telecommunications Comm.

---

- **Next message:** Ronda Hauben: "Re: Greetings from the FCC"
- **Previous message:** Dennis Golombek: "Re: leverage vs. equity"

# Re: Greetings from the FCC

Ronda Hauben ([rh120@columbia.edu](mailto:rh120@columbia.edu))

Thu, 5 Sep 1996 05:23:11 -0400 (EDT)

- ☐ Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
- ☐ Next message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply to Ronda's Reply"
- ☐ Previous message: calvin branche: "second week thoughts"

---

Open email to Reed Hundt,  
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission

I wondered if you could explain a bit about the nature of the online seminar mailing list on Universal Service that Bob Carlitz is moderating? In welcoming the seminar you wrote:

>To Seminar Participants:

>Greetings and good luck in beginning your on-line course! Bob Carlitz  
>has set up a great example of the way technology can increase  
>communication, learning, and participation in public debate.

>As you know, Universal Service policy will impact all Americans, but it's  
>especially important for our education hubs: schools and libraries.  
>Universal Service can help bridge the gap between the information  
>"haves" and "have nots" by giving every child the tools and knowledge  
essential for the 21st century.

>I look forward to reading your course discussions in the official FCC  
>record, and thank you for your contribution to this important  
>policy-making process.

>Best Regards,

>Reed Hundt  
>Chairman, Federal Communications Commission

Reed, my questions are:

In comments to the FCC on the issue of Universal Service, in email, and in questions raised at the INET '96 (the Internet Society Meeting) in Montreal to the FCC chief of staff who gave a talk for you, and in a Report from INET '96 circulated on the Internet after the conference, I stressed the importance of opening up the comment process in the rule making procedure so that those who would be affected by the rule making on the issue of universal service in the new Telecommunications Act would have a chance to provide input to the FCC on this issue. Others have supported this sentiment.

Yet no one from the FCC ever commented on these comments nor made any effort to talk about the need for some form of online process to open up the rule making process.

Instead there was this online seminar announced. Who is funding it and why? And what is the role of the FCC in the online seminar?

Is the online seminar to be a means for the FCC to justify removing universal service from the home telephone user by raising the cost

of their service to subsidize school and library service because corporate entities will be getting all kinds of lower prices from the new telecommunications law?

Why was the online seminar created with a strict moderator to direct discussion away from the broad set of issues that need to be discussed and considered in any rulemaking process regarding universal service? Why wasn't the unmoderated prototype created by the NTIA online hearing on the issue of the future of the Net held in Nov. 1994 followed, where there were newsgroups created and a mailing list and public access terminals made available around the country to provide for a broad set of views and input? (See <http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/netbook/> -- especially chapter 11 and 14 describing that online conference)

Didn't the Communications Act of 1934 charge the FCC with promoting "a rapid, efficient, nationwide and worldwide wire and radio communications service with adequate facilities at reasonable charge"?

Has that changed? Has the FCC now become the U.S. Department of Education obligated to provide service to the schools and libraries at the cost of the home user?

Previously the Department of Education was obligated to oversee what was provided to the schools and libraries out of general tax funds. Has the new telecommunications act changed that so that the home telephone user is now obligated to support lower prices for the schools and libraries for undefined telecommunications services and at the expense of POTS for the home user?

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 was drafted with no discussion nor input allowed from the home user, those who have the need for the universal service provision. Instead the teleco's and even some nonprofits had a means to promote their interests to those in the U.S. Congress. But laws, especially laws regarding telecommunications infrastructure need to be crafted considering the interests of all involved. If the issue before the FCC is the issue of universal service, then the needs and interests of the home user have to be solicited and considered.

In my efforts to participate in the current seminar, just as in my efforts to contribute comments to the proceedings, I have tried to raise the questions involving the interests and concerns of the home user. These should be similar to the interests of those involved in the schools and libraries. However, instead of the FCC encouraging seeing this similarity of interest, there seems to be the encouragement that schools and libraries seek out to get lower rates at the expense of the home user.

Subsidizing school and libraries at the expense of the home telephone user cannot provide for universal service. It can only provide for the taking away of universal service where the home user is seen as needing a certain minimal level of service (traditionally called POTS - Plain old telephone service).

Is there some reason why the FCC has not addressed this issue? Also, the issue of providing funds to schools and libraries for telecommunications should be part of what the U.S. Department of Education funds out of general tax revenue, not a burden on the home telephone user. Or it should be the concern of the National Science Foundation, or other appropriate government body. The National Science Foundation demonstrated that by providing start up funding for access to the Internet to colleges and universities it helped make that access broadly available in the academic community. The U.S. government should be drawing

on these lessons and creating a similar way to make access available to schools and libraries. But it isn't the home telephone user who can be asked to subsidize such access or it will lead to the taking away of universal service rather than a means of implementing universal service.

Regardless of what the telecommunications act of 1996 states, the job of the FCC is to provide Congress with the information and background to understand the needs and interests of those for whom universal service was crafted over 50 years ago.

A moderated seminar with a moderator who is encouraging schools and libraries to see their interests as different from those of the home telephone user cannot be helpful in sorting out the principles to guide universal service rulemaking.

Also an online moderated process which discourages the broad discussion that is needed to determine the principles that are needed to guide rulemaking can't be helpful.

Since I have clearly asked for an online process, I wondered why instead of anyone from the FCC ever contacting me or discussing what I was proposing, a strictly controlled and moderated seminar was set up to narrowly focus the issues that could be discussed.

Who is funding this effort and why?

And why isn't the FCC willing to help open up the rule making process so that appropriate rules can be drafted?

In the development of the Internet, J.C.R. Licklider, who was one of the important visionaries helping to guide the earliest developments that led to the Net, recognized that when there is a need to figure out a real problem, a broad investigation is necessary to solve the problem. "There's a lot of reason for adopting a broad delimitation rather than a narrow one because if you are trying to find out where ideas come from, you don't want to isolate yourself from the areas they come from." (see quote in Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet, chapter 8, <http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/netbook/>)

Ronda  
rh120@columbia.edu  
ae547@yfn.ysu.edu  
-----

Netizens: On the History and Impact  
of Usenet and the Internet  
<http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/netbook>

- 
- ☐ Next message: [Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply to Ronda's Reply"](#)
  - ☐ Previous message: [calvin branche: "second week thoughts"](#)

# Re: Reply to Ronda's Reply

Ronda Hauben ([rh120@columbia.edu](mailto:rh120@columbia.edu))

Thu, 5 Sep 1996 05:56:11 -0400 (EDT)

- ☐ Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
- ☐ Next message: Bob Carlitz: "Why the Internet?"
- ☐ Previous message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Greetings from the FCC"
- ☐ Maybe in reply to: Steve Kohn: "Reply to Ronda's Reply"

---

Replying to "Steve Kohn" <NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM>

>Replies to Ronda's replies. And I agree with the moderator's note.

>> But who is working on making Internet access, particularly access  
>> to the worldwide communication that the Internet makes possible  
>> available to everyone in the U.S.? That's why the concept of  
>> POTS (Plain Old Telephone Service) was so important as it provided  
>> a minimum that would be available to everyone.

>>  
>> It seems once you start saying there is no need for a minimum  
>> service, you can argue for all sorts of things, but the minimum  
>> gets lost and therefore not available.

>Reply:

>In my mind once you have defined a minimum, you might just have also  
>defined the maximum.

>I think the full range of telecommunications services should be available to  
>schools via US.

>Again, I don't think we should fixate on Internet access as the solution  
>to all of the needs of education.

The confusion here is that unless there is a basic equivalent of  
POTS established with regard to the home user having access to  
the Internet, there is no means of making sure it is available  
to all.

By setting a minimum standard, one makes it possible to determine  
what is essential.

By talking about "maximum" definitions, one doesn't ever figure  
out what is essential.

>> I've wondered why NYNEX hasn't helped there to be a free-net or  
>> community network in NYC. NYC is a major city and yet it is  
>> backward in what it offers its citizens. Several of us presented  
>> talks at the NYPL (New York Public Library) about the important  
>> communications that the Internet made possible. Many people came  
>> to the talks. Several of those who came felt it was crucial  
>> for NYC to have some form of community network that would provide  
>> basic access to Usenet newsgroups and email and a text based  
>> browser like the Freenets and community networks provide in  
>> many other cities around the U.S. and in a number of cities in  
>> Canada. The talks were announced in lots of the local

>> newspapers that announce events. Also, the talks were announced on  
>> Usenet. I would have expected someone from NYNEX to have been  
>> interested. However, no one got in contact with us or seemed  
>> interested.

>Reply:

>It sounds like an interesting discussion and if I had known about it I would  
>have probably attended.

>I live on Long Island so I don't read the local NYC papers and even though I'm  
>on the Internet daily, I don't participate in Usenet newsgroups yet. So...  
>next time you are going to have a meeting please email me with the info.

>Thanks

Good to hear that you would be willing to attend.

But meanwhile we spent a year giving talks and several people made efforts toward trying to determine what would help there to be a NYC community network like the Cleveland Freenet and still there is no community network or Freenet in NYC.

My conclusion is that there needs to be government support for such (as in Canada) and that that helps others in the community or city to work together to make something that is needed happen.

In Canada, various government entities have encouraged and even helped with start up funds for a freenet or community network.

In Amsterdam, Holland, the city council provided start up funds.

This has begun to provide minimal Internet access available free to those dialing up from home.

This is the establishment of a minimal level of Internet access available to all (so they can for example have a way to send email to the FCC or other government bodies and participate in other public forums on important issues).

This is what this forum should be discussing as an example of how universal service might be provided to all home users in the U.S. Instead I am being told this is off topic.

Thus the real issue of how to provide a POIS (Plain Old Internet Service) is off topic in a discussion that is supposedly dealing with universal service.

>> That's why it seems that there needs to be some government provision  
>> identifying what is a minimum standard and providing the regulation  
>> to provide for it. Otherwise it would seem that the teleco's would  
>> determine what they think is needed, and citizens will be considered  
>> "customers" rather than citizens.

>Reply:

>I think you have a misconception on how this procedure is going to be rolled  
>out. Telcos will not be deciding what is offered to schools and  
>libraries - the FCC will. See above for comments on minimum standards.

But who is the FCC able to get comments from as input into the process?

It seems that the interests of the home user are still very poorly represented in this whole process. Who has the ability to influence the FCC? They claim to be following the mandates of a law that the



U.S. Congress created by asking the Teleco's what they wanted, and now the FCC is being asked to put the final touches on the process.

So it seems that there is a need to discuss the interests of the home user and the rationale behind POTS as it seems to have been lost in the whole process that created the current Telecommunications Act.

The process of radically restructuring the Telecommunications Act without inviting and making possible the input of those most affected by it, the home user, demonstrates a serious breach of democratic processes by the U.S. Congress. It is now up to the FCC to open the process up, and unfortunately that isn't yet happening.

>> Steve, is there some reason that NYNEX isn't in support of having  
>> a Freenet or local community network like the Cleveland Free-Net in  
>> New York City? Is there some reason that they haven't been encouraging  
>> to have such a minimal set of access to Usenet newsgroups, email  
>> and a text based browser made available to everyone at a low or  
>> free cost so that people will have some minimal level of Internet  
>> connection available as people in the U.S. in other cities like  
>> Cleveland, and Youngstown, and Washington D.C. and Los Angeles, etc.  
>> have available?

>Reply:

>Access isn't the limiting factor for people to participate in free-nets. More  
>people have phone service. How many people have PCs equipped with modems???

There are many more people who have computers than have Internet access.

And whenever a freenet opens its doors, there is run on modems  
so that many more people get them.

The value of a free-net is that it provides a common means of  
people having access to the communications facilities of the Internet -  
to Usenet newsgroups, and email. Also, they make some www available,  
(though much of the www involves information rather than interactive  
communication and thus is less important if communication is the  
criteria of what to make available.)

>I can't speak for NYNEX, but I think we would be more than willing to  
>sit down with any group that is thinking about forming a freenet in  
>NYC. Please see other discussion on this board concerning the Buffalo  
>freenet and NYNEX's involvement.

How does one go about setting up such a meeting?

What kind of government support would be helpful to make such happen?

Clearly there is a problem as there is no freenet or community network  
in NYC and it is hard to know where to even start in the process.

This is some of what actually helps make minimal access available,  
and it shouldn't be left as an impossible burden on a few individuals,  
but there need to be social and political structures that help  
solve the problems.

Ronda  
rh120@columbia.edu

- 
- ☐ **Next message: Bob Carlitz: "Why the Internet?"**
  - ☐ **Previous message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Greetings from the FCC"**

- ☐ **Maybe in reply to: Steve Kohn: "Reply to Ronda's Reply"**

# Why the Internet?

Bob Carlitz ([bob@info-ren.pitt.edu](mailto:bob@info-ren.pitt.edu))

Wed, 4 Sep 1996 14:43:01 -0400 (EDT)

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Ronda Hauben: "re: Professional Development - comments on comments"
  - Previous message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply to Ronda's Reply"
  - Next in thread: Link Shadley: "Re: Why the Internet?"
- 

This is partly a response to some comments from Steve Kohn and partly an explanation of why the Internet gets mentioned again and again in discussions surrounding Universal Service subsidies for schools and libraries.

The key to an understanding of why the Internet is such an important resource for schools and libraries is SCALABILITY. The Internet has a structure which allows it to accommodate increasing numbers of users at a given site or at multiple sites in a region without a wholesale re-engineering of the system and without costs which grow in strict proportion to the number of users.

The reason for the Internet's scalability has to do with the manner in which it makes use of shared infrastructure, whether it be in terms of shared space on servers, shared use of a Local Area Network or shared infrastructure on the Wide Area Network or Internet proper.

I don't believe that any other telecommunications services provide two-way communications with anything approaching the efficiency of the Internet. This is why Internet access for all schools and classrooms is an economic possibility. And this is why discussions of the implementation of Universal Service provisions for schools and libraries must ultimately involve the Internet. While other services may be very attractive, most of these services will always be very limited in their use, because they lack the scalability to make them affordable for implementation on a large scale.

As technologies evolve we'll probably see other examples which equal the Internet in terms of scalability and affordability. This is why it's probably wise to develop language for Universal Service subsidies which is not too technology-specific. On the other hand it's important to keep in the mind the goals of the Telecommunications Act, which speak of access from every classroom and library, and which hence imply a scalable infrastructure underlying whatever services may be contemplated.

Bob Carlitz  
Moderator

---

- Next message: Ronda Hauben: "re: Professional Development - comments on

comments"

- **Previous message:** Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply to Ronda's Reply"
- **Next in thread:** Link Shadley: "Re: Why the Internet?"

## re: Professional Development - comments on comments

Ronda Hauben ([rh120@columbia.edu](mailto:rh120@columbia.edu))  
Thu, 5 Sep 1996 06:53:32 -0400 (EDT)

- ☐ Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
  - ☐ Next message: Bob Carlitz: "tangled thread"
  - ☐ Previous message: Bob Carlitz: "Why the Internet?"
  - ☐ Next in thread: Mario Zinga: "re: Professional Development - comments on comments"
- 

Responding to "Steve Kohn" <NOTES.SKOHNA50VM1.trg.nynex.COM>

>My wife is a 2nd grade teacher. She doesn't have the time or  
>inclination to develop content from resources on the Internet. All I  
>do is education, and I don't see a ground swell of teachers interested  
>in speeding hours on the Internet first finding data, developing it  
>into useful information and then integrating it into curriculum.

But what do you see the Internet as? It has developed because  
it is a means of communication, not because it is a means of  
"information".

Communication means the discussion between different points of  
view, one person building on what another does, someone asking  
a question or sending out a call for help and getting responses  
from others, etc..

That is very different from needing someone to develop content.

For example, last term I taught an introduction to Unix class.

I wasn't sure what it made sense to teach as this was the first  
time I was teaching the class. I posted on an appropriate newsgroup  
and probably 10 different people responding providing me with  
various kinds of help.

One person helped to sort out what it was essential to cover.  
Another pointed out some [www](http://www) sites where there were helpful  
materials I could point students to, etc.

Also, now there is a set of k-12 newsgroups that kids  
and teachers can post on.

Students and teachers can regularly utilize the Internet  
to communicate with the world on all sorts of issues.

See for example, chapter 2 in our online book "Netizens:  
On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet"  
<http://www.columbia.edu/~hauben/netbook/>

The chapter "The Evolution of Usenet: The Poor Man's ARPANET"  
describes how a student turned to the Net for a term paper  
he was doing and all the remarkable responses he received from  
around the world. It also describes how the Usenet pioneers  
began Usenet as a means of poor man's networking. And it  
describes how the people online gained from the time they

put into the development of Usenet and in the process contributed the content that makes up Usenet.

>Of course, like in everything else, there are a few teachers who will  
>do this and enjoy it. They might even share with other teachers. Once  
>this starts to be come popular you will have companies like Scholastic  
>(and they have already started - Scholastic Online) to package Internet  
>based content for \$\$.

This is in opposition to the whole development of the Internet.

I recognize that there are those who want to turn the Internet into a 500 channel video system or home shopping, but then it ceases to be the important new educational media that it is.

Those teachers who find the Internet interesting will contribute back to it. Those seeking to make money from it, can do what they do, but it isn't that there should be public subsidy of their efforts.

In the days of the AUP (the Acceptible Use Policy) one was expected to contribute to the Internet and to help support and promote educational uses. That is some of what is needed today, not public promotion of commercializing education.

>Access should not be equated to content!

You might find it of value to read the online book we have made available "Netizens". As it shows that in fact it is the users who provide the content and have in the development of the Internet. I recognize there is an effort today to change that on the part of those promoting a commercial Internet, but that will lead to the loss of the great social and educational value of the Internet.

(...)

>I don't know what you are referring to when you say the T.A. "... puts  
>providing cut rates to businesses and subsidies to corporate entities  
>above providing universal service."

>What cut rates and what subsidies?

The law provides a way for corporate users to get lower rates as they can and have supported the so called "competition" whereby they get lower rates.

Home users, however, do not end up with lower rates. Home users, and in the long term, all telephone users, benefitted greatly from having a regulated telecommunications infrastructure where there was the obligation on AT&T to support research into new technologies. Bell Labs inventions have greatly reduced the price of telephone service more than any so called "competitive" marketing will ever do.

We have all lost by the send of support for Bell Labs research.

By the FCC and other government officials supporting the short term profit considerations of large corporate users, we have lost a very precious resource.

Now while corporate users can negotiate for lower rates for themselves, the home user is being left with outdated technology and now the burden of providing subsidies to libraries and schools so they

get cheaper service.

Instead of the new Telecommunication Act providing an extension of universal service, it is actually taking away universal service from the home user.

(...)

>How is minimal access to the Internet being denied to the people of NYC????

>Anyone with a phone, PC, modem and an ISP has access! Most people have  
>phone service. There are numerous PCs and modem vendors, and tons of  
>ISPs in NYC - so what is the problem you are referring to?

There is a need to have a minimal level of access available so people can both learn how to get online and learn how the online communication made possible by the Internet is of value.

Maybe you don't realize that for many people the money charged for Internet access by ISPs is a barrier to them getting online. There have been times in my life I couldn't afford \$10 a month for online access (and with the way the economy is going in the U.S. I anticipate that may again soon be the case.)

I was able to get online because Cleveland Freenet provided free access and I was able to dial in on a local phone call. (I lived in the Midwest at the time.) I had heard of Usenet and how valuable it was, but wasn't able to commit \$10 a month to paying for access.

Others who don't have computers or modems have an even greater barrier. There are freenets and community network programs that gather old computers and make them available to people who don't have computers. And they do the same for schools. Also, through the freenets and community networks one can learn how to get online and that makes it easier to ask the questions of people online toward upgrading ones computer, kinds of access etc.

This is a way to get started.

>> Don't we have to sort out what is important. I recognize that certain  
>> minimal sectors of the U.S. were asked what they wanted by Congress  
>> when they drafted the Telecommunications Act of 1996, but they left out  
>> the majority of us and therefore to now go along and only discuss what  
>> the telcos asked for is not going to provide what we who should have  
>> been involved in the process much earlier need and have been fighting  
>> for.

>Reply:

>Senators Snow and Rockefeller orginated the concept of US for Schools  
>and Libraries, not the telcos. The telcos are presently meeting with  
>most of the major national educational organizations to help develop  
>workable US definitions and procedures.

Changing the meaning of universal service from providing access to the home user, to providing something for schools and libraries, is an effort to get schools and libraries to support the current telecommunications restructuring that is at the expense of the home user. It is not in the interests of the home user, nor of the libraries or educational institutions.

The interests of the home user are the most important interests and those are being left out. Therefore the telecommunications infrastructure in the U.S. will be the looser though there may be high profits for some teleco's (which seems their only concern,

not providing a public utility) and some cheaper rates for libraries or some schools.

---

- ☐ Next message: Bob Carlitz: "tangled thread"
- ☐ Previous message: Bob Carlitz: "Why the Internet?"
- ☐ Next in thread: Mario Zinga: "re: Professional Development - comments on comments"



# tangled thread

Bob Carlitz ([bob@info-ren.pitt.edu](mailto:bob@info-ren.pitt.edu))  
Thu, 5 Sep 1996 23:31:22 -0400 (EDT)

- Messages sorted by: [ date | thread | subject | author ]
  - Next message: Sylvia Nespoli: "Inclusion of post-secondary"
  - Previous message: Ronda Hauben: "re: Professional Development - comments on comments"
- 

Thanks to Jim Warner for pointing out just how tangled they were. There was a bug in the software that we have been using to present the on-line discussions via the Web site. As a result the "thread" index didn't show messages in their logical threads. Sometimes it did, but half the time it organized things incorrectly. Please take another at these indices, which have been reconstructed after the bug was fixed. They provide a useful snapshot of the ongoing discussion.

While I am talking about technicalities, I should mention a few points related to this thread structure. You have no doubt noticed that messages from the list appear with a "From:" line indicating the original sender. This means that a simple reply will send your response back to the sender alone. If you want to reply to the list as a whole, you can use a "group reply" or "reply to all recipients" command. The way this works is that your mailer will pick up the "To:" line and the "Cc:" from the original message, one of which will specify [us-nd@info-ren.pitt.edu](mailto:us-nd@info-ren.pitt.edu), which is the address of the mailing list itself.

The thread index is constructed by looking to see if a given message was issued through a reply command, as described above. Typically, the reply will use the same subject line as the original message, prefixed by "Re:". You can change the subject line in your reply, perhaps to focus the discussion a little bit, but keep in mind that any reply will show up in the same thread. This means that it can be confusing if you use a reply command just to avoid typing the full address of the mailing list.

Thanks to Jim for pointing out this particular glitch, which must have been bothering many of you, at least subliminally. I know that after Jim pointed out the problem I realized that the threads had been looking weird, but somehow they hadn't been weird enough to catch my attention. Those of you with an eye for such things should send notes to [info@info-ren.pitt.edu](mailto:info@info-ren.pitt.edu) if you spot other items that need to be fixed. Thanks for your help - and for your tolerance of the occasional slip-up.

Bob Carlitz  
Moderator

---

- Next message: Sylvia Nespoli: "Inclusion of post-secondary"